

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 93 04:30:45 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #36
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 12 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 36

Today's Topics:

 Abandonment of CW
 CW by hand? (4 msgs)
 Re: Abandonment of CW
 RF Design ltr: call for power reduction in amateur service
 The no-code issue (4 msgs)
 What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses? (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 9 Feb 93 22:11:05 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!caen!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Abandonment of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb09.154100.139420@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

[I wrote the original note that started this thread.]

In article <VBREAUULT.93Feb8171035@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com
(Val Breault) writes:

<stuff deleted here and there with no further notice>

>I too am an Extra Class amateur radio operator and I use Morse code
>almost exclusively when operating on the HF bands. While I would

>scarcely call my stand strident, I would fully support a motion to
>replace the high speed Morse code requirement with a filter that is
>at least as difficult, but much more contemporary.

Well... Since I was quoted, I guess I'd better respond.

Dana, I look forward to your posts because I value your opinion. I have learned a lot from you. However, there's either been a misunderstanding here or we differ on an issue. Please allow me to restate my views.

What is all this talk about filters? Somehow people have forgotten why the incentive licensing system was developed. The point was not to exclude hams. The point was to give hams an incentive to learn more material and be of greater value to the amateur service. Furthermore, the idea was the amateur would be of greater service to the American people.

Okay, perhaps we could substitute the word "challenge" for "filter". Would that change anything? I believe that folks value most those things they had to work hardest to obtain. Since I believe that way, it follows that I believe that the higher class licenses should be more difficult to obtain than the lower class licenses. Not just difficult for difficulties sake, but they ought to be able to show that they are technically qualified to hold those licenses.

I know that there are some (Gary, for example) that don't believe the same way as I do. That's okay. That's the stuff that keeps discussions interesting.

Each license class brings with increased privileges. It isn't that the higher licenses are designed to keep people out.

>I made a game of it. It was fun. I really got a charge out of
>speeding up the code generator...

Sure CW is fun, but how does higher speed CW enhance the value of the amateur service today? The FCC has not set up the incentive licensing to simply challenge us to do arbitrary things. Incentive licensing is supposed to improve the value of the amateur service. However, since incentive licensing was enacted, it would appear the amateur service has become of less value to the American people.

I agree with you that high speed Morse code adds almost nothing to the amateur radio service. Perhaps you missed it, but I've said it as plainly as I know how on numerous occasions. I even said it in this particular post, a couple of paragraphs later. I believe that the high speed Morse code requirement is simply "difficult for difficulties sake". I would fully support a motion to replace it with a more

relevant "challenge".

>I don't remember how long I worked on it.... Something like four
>or five months.

When I was a kid (19) I used CW all the time. Last year, when I thought I'd better get my Extra, I played Super Morse at 22WPM. I found that my copy was still better than 80%. I found the CW boring, too. It didn't take much practice to get ready for the test.

Note: One more case where it didn't take a lot of effort to raise an interested operators code speed. Your mileage may vary. :-) :-)

>FACT:

>The high speed code requirement isn't going to go away any time soon.

Why is this a fact? This sounds like an opinion to me.

Dana, by using the time honored tactic of being vague, I've cleverly managed to slip that one in there. However, pressed to reply, I'll say:

I have seen NO formal mention from the FCC the ARRL or any other body that proposes to remove the high speed Morse code requirement. If I've missed a NPRM regarding that then please set me straight. If one were to appear in tomorrows mail it would still be more than a year before the requirement went away..... still not "any time soon."

>OPINION:

>In light of that fact, I believe that anyone that is waiting for
>the requirements to change before proceeding with an upgrade is
>either wasting time, rattling sabers or isn't really all that
>interested in upgrading.

Possibly the upgraded privileges aren't worth the effort involved for some people?

Why do you think they could not be grouped in that third class?
("[not] all that interested in upgrading")

>When you've gotten your Extra Class license and have nothing to
>gain by removal of the high speed CW requirement, then you can join
>us in our campaign to remove it. Somehow it sounds classier coming
>from an Extra than from a Technician. :-) :-)

Lookie here. Did you see that? I said it again. "... the high speed CW requirement, ... join us ... to remove it."

Sure, when I was a lowly Advanced class operator, I was criticized

for being "anti-CW", I was told that I just wanted my Extra for nothing. Well, I easily passed the damn test, now let's take a fresh look and leave the sentimentality behind. Anyone opposed to reforming the CW requirements needs to answer me this: How do the 13 and 20 WPM requirements further the charter of the Amateur Service?

Dana properly notes a regrettably common characteristic of humans, that is, the suspicion that people that propose changes to the status-quo must have some hidden agenda. That too, will not go away any time soon.

In the mean time, I propose that those folks that are teetering on the edge trying to make up their minds about upgrading to Extra "just do it". I did it, Dana did it and so did a WHOLE LOT of other people. You can too.

P.S. Dana, if you happen to see Rich N6LRT (used to work there) tell him that Val from SHARE says "HI".

--

-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N8OEF
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

\\ /|
\\ / |
\\ /__|
\\ / |__

Date: 10 Feb 93 12:50:17 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!udel!gvls1!news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW by hand?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 02:09:39 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!
alanb@ames.arpa
Subject: CW by hand?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, ean@gvls2.vfl.paramax.com (Ed Naratil) writes:

>From Part 97:

>97.503(a) A telegraphy examination MUST BE SUFFICIENT TO PROVE that the
> examinee has the ABILITY TO SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND and to receive
> correctly be ear texts in the international Morse code at not less
> than the prescribed speed, ...

>97.509(d) Passing a telegraphy RECEIVING examination is ADEQUATE PROOF of an
> examinee's ABILITY to both SEND and receive telegraphy. The
> administering VEs, however, MAY also include a sending segment
> in a telegraphy examination.

>(caps mine)

You're right, these two sections seem to contradict. The answer is that most people find sending much easier than receiving (at a given speed). If you can copy 13 wpm, you can almost certainly send 13 wpm.

AL N1AL

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 02:09:39 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!
alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW by hand?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, ean@gvls2.vfl.paramax.com (Ed Naratil) writes:

>From Part 97:

>97.503(a) A telegraphy examination MUST BE SUFFICIENT TO PROVE that the
> examinee has the ABILITY TO SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND and to receive
> correctly be ear texts in the international Morse code at not less
> than the prescribed speed, ...

>97.509(d) Passing a telegraphy RECEIVING examination is ADEQUATE PROOF of an
> examinee's ABILITY to both SEND and receive telegraphy. The
> administering VEs, however, MAY also include a sending segment
> in a telegraphy examination.

>(caps mine)

You're right, these two sections seem to contradict. The answer is that most people find sending much easier than receiving (at a given speed). If you can copy 13 wpm, you can almost certainly send 13 wpm.

AL N1AL

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 06:45:04 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!stanford.edu!CSD-
NewsHost.Stanford.EDU!seligman@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW by hand?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Alan Bloom writes:

>
> Ed Naratil writes:
>
>>97.503(a) A telegraphy examination MUST BE SUFFICIENT TO PROVE that the
>> examinee has the ABILITY TO SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND and to receive..
>
>>97.509(d) Passing a telegraphy RECEIVING examination is ADEQUATE PROOF of an
>> examinee's ABILITY to both SEND and receive telegraphy.
>
> You're right, these two sections seem to contradict.

There's no contradiction here. (a) says that you must prove you can
send code. (d) says that one way to prove this is to simply receive code.
Now you might disagree with the wisdom of this, but it's certainly
consistent.

Scott Seligman KN6EV

Internet: seligman@CS.Stanford.EDU
UUCP: {uunet,decwrl,sun}!cs.stanford.edu!seligman
Packet: kn6ev @ n0ary.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Tue, 9 Feb 1993 20:34:24 GMT
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!
alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Re: Abandonment of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com (Val Breault) writes:

>... I would fully support a motion to
>replace the high speed Morse code requirement with a filter that is
>at least as difficult, but much more contemporary.

I agree with this wholeheartedly. The problem is it won't likely happen. For example, when the code requirement was removed for the Technician license, the written test remained exactly the same. In fact, the Technician exam used to include the material from both element 3A and 3B (General exam); now it is 3A only.

The trend has been toward more privileges and less requirements. That is just the nature of politics, and there's probably nothing to be done about it.

AL N1AL

Date: 11 Feb 93 21:35:04 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: RF Design ltr: call for power reduction in amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

See page 11 in Feb. 1993 RF Design.

(there was an earlier article in August 1992 RF Design that called for consumer equipment to be more resistant to EMI. Don't have that issue right here, so i can't find out if the numbers used in the letter were in that article or elsewhere...)

Robert Orban of Belmont, CA, states that the FCC has measured a 9V/m field from a next door 1 kW transmitter. Orban takes the stand that 9 V/m is a HUGE absurd amount of RF for a piece of consumer equipment to reject.

He argues that the cost of implementing suppression on a \$300 (retail) VTR would significantly affect the selling price of the equipment and goes on to ask why tens of millions of consumers should be taxed to permit a few amateurs to indulge in their hobby. He calls for a power reduction to 10 W (to bring the 9 V/m field down to 0.9 V/m) to get the field level in the same ballpark as other services like cell radiophones.

Orban's final statement is: "It is time for the FCC to act to reduce the permissible RF fields that amateurs can blast into their neighbors' homes."

Given the hysteria over the 0.6 W hand held cell radiophones, what would be a reasonable response to this call to reduce transmitter power? How do you go about getting people to understand that power output does not translate directly into coverage at the HF end of the dial...?

(would be funny if this is the Orban that's involved with broadcast signal processing equipment...i think that's the way the name's spelled on the

compressor/limiter on the local college station's equipment rack..8)).

Date: 10 Feb 93 14:28:54 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!caen!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!

vbreaault@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: The no-code issue

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QB77DE00@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

How many proponents of no-code, or of the reduction of the speed requirements, are from people who "can't do it?" Or from people who know people who can't [seem to, or are unwilling to] do it/learn it?

Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

Nope.... Bad analogy there Howard. It would be a good analogy if there were colleges or universities that required proven abilities in the design and construction of spark gap transmitters in order to enter their MSEE program.

If such universities existed then I believe even you would agree that the ability to design and construct spark gap equipment is no longer a relevant criteria for admission. You, among many others, would hope that the school would change the requirement to embrace a more contemporary discipline.

I am among a number of folks that would like to raise the technical requirements and replace the Morse code requirement with one that is at least as difficult, but more relevant to radio at THIS turn of the century.

I acknowledge that it would be quite difficult to administer, but I'd actually like to see a structure that would allow the applicant to choose the challenge that interests him the most. Perhaps even Morse code. :-) :-)

Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

Howard KE7QJ hlester@as.arizona.edu

Why don't you upgrade? 20wpm isn't all that hard and the technical exam for Extra is actually shamefully easy.

--

-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N80EF
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

\\ /|
\\ /|
\\ /__|
\\ /__|

Date: 10 Feb 93 16:09:05 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QB77DE00@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:
>Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to
>demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance
>requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school
>grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

I disagree. At least high school grades and SAT scores have some relevance to the skills needed at college. Making Morse proficiency 50% of the exam is like requiring students to demonstrate they can hand forge horseshoes at industrial rates before being allowed into engineering school.

>Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I
>feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum
>that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

While I think Generals got a raw deal, that's water over the dam. What I'm concerned about is that the privilege be earned by demonstrating relevant skills for the privilege granted. There is no obvious connection between voice, SSTV, RTTY, or packet privileges and high speed Morse. IMHO, Morse skills should only count toward Morse privileges.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 10 Feb 93 05:53:43 GMT
From: eram!dave@sphinx.uchicago.edu
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QB77DE00@mmpc6>,
hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

| How many proponents of no-code, or of the reduction of the speed
| requirements, are from people who "can't do it?" Or from people who know
| people who can't [seem to, or are unwilling to] do it/learn it?

Yes, I'm a proponent of no-code, or at least the easing of the
requirements. No, I am not totally code-less, as you would see from my
callsign (if you were familiar with the Australian scheme).

| Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to
| demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance
| requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school
| grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

Plainly, this is a religious war that will never die; at least, not
until the next general WARC. Arguing about it is a waste of bandwidth.

| Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I
| feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum
| that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

And I am denied access to some HF bands (40m, 20m etc) because of my
unwillingness to learn to receive an old modulation technique at high
speeds, but guess what? I don't miss them! Yes, I have operated
there, under supervision from a "real" (sic) amateur; I guess some
people enjoy that sort of thing. I'll stick with packet radio,
microwaves and spread-spectrum, thanks. At least above 30 MHz I have
full privileges; this is not a "sour grapes" attitude but a matter of
personal preference.

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munnar!esi.COM.AU!dave

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 93 16:29:54 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QB77DE00@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:
>How many proponents of no-code, or of the reduction of the speed
>requirements, are from people who "can't do it?" Or from people who know
>people who can't [seem to, or are unwilling to] do it/learn it?
>
>Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to
>demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance
>requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school
>grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

If it can/could be shown that high school grades and/or SAT scores had
no relevance as to a student's ability to successfully complete a
particular college program, then, indeed, I would argue for the
removal of those requirements (I don't, by the way, believe that
to be the case.)

>Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I
>feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum
>that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

The problem that many (I'm also a general) don't understand is
why they must learn code to operate in non-CW modes. More importantly,
why must they learn anything above 5wpm (assuming we accept that as
an international requirement at this time.) to operate non-CW below
30MHz? Most of those that oppose the current CW requirements are
not saying there shouldn't be requirements of theory, etc, it is
that they see no value in being tested for a mode they don't want to
use. Time was when everyone took a driver's test on a manual shift
auto. Today that's not required, and yet, once you get a driver's
license you are permitted to drive a manual gearbox vehicle. Odd's
are that if a ham gets a no-code license, they are not going to
just try operating CW without becoming proficient to some degree
before attempting on-the-air CW QSOs. In fact, a no-code Tech is
not prohibited from using CW in the bands above 30MHz, the no-code
has full operating privileges above 30MHz including the 50.0 to
50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1 CW only segments of the 6m and 2m bands.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 10 Feb 93 15:16:58 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```
>>> call kb6qmu
>Call-Sign: KB6QMU                      Class: NOVICE
>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI           Birthday: DEC 30, 1927
>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285
>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA
>Valid From: APR 14, 1987                To: APR 14, 1997
>Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987
>
>>> call kk6ch
>Call-Sign: KK6CH                      Class: ADVANCED
>Previously: N6PFB                     Class: GENERAL
>Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI           Birthday: DEC 30, 1927
>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285
>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA
>Valid From: NOV 14, 1989                To: NOV 14, 1999
>Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989
```

I guess someone could drop 'em a card to find out what's up, but i suspect somewhere along the line either the middle initial was dropped and the old records weren't properly linked up or some bored input operator added in an "x" to fill the form hole on the computer screen. Also someone could have thought the "x" to be a "no entry" box filler on a form and dropped it (since the newer license doesn't have it).

a 1988 and 1989 printed call book would probably show a linkage (unless they didn't catch it either....)

bill wb9ivr

Date: Tue, 09 Feb 93 15:45:48 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@ames.arpa
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson) writes:

```
>Part 97.5(d)(1) "A primary station license is issued only to a person,
>together with an operator license on the same document. Every amateur
>operator licensed by the FCC must have one, but only one, primary
>station license."
```

Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

I think a VE made a mistake once?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 10 Feb 93 08:18:21 EST

From: usc!sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!ncrhub2!ncrgw2!psinntp!

arrrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, lockhart@mothra.nts.uci.edu (Jack C. Lockhart)
writes:

>In article <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

>>In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson)
writes:

>>>Part 97.5(d)(1) "A primary station license is issued only to a person,
>>>together with an operator license on the same document. Every amateur
>>>operator licensed by the FCC must have one, but only one, primary
>>>station license."

>>

>>Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

>>

>>I think a VE made a mistake once?

>>

>>--

>> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are

*

>> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily

*

>> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

*

>> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

>

>Well, let's see what marvin says.

>

>>> call kb6qmu

>Call-Sign: KB6QMU Class: NOVICE

>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

```

>Valid From: APR 14, 1987          To: APR 14, 1997
>Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987
>
>>> call kk6ch
>Call-Sign: KK6CH                  Class: ADVANCED
>Previously: N6PFB                 Class: GENERAL
>Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI        Birthday: DEC 30, 1927
>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285
>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA
>Valid From: NOV 14, 1989          To: NOV 14, 1999
>Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989
>
>Oops!
>
>Dana's right. Wonder what's going on here?
>

```

Yes, it's possible for someone to have two US licenses. However, as soon as the FCC realizes that this is the case, they will usually dismiss the lesser class license.

A typical scenario is:

1. Applicant passes Novice elements; application is sent directly to FCC as required.
2. One week to five weeks later, the applicant goes to a VEC-coordinated upgrade session; either forgets to bring the earlier Novice credit, or brings only part of it, or retakes the Novice written followed by the Technician written (maybe even takes the General code and written). The applicant does not tell the VEs that an earlier application is pending (or didn't know to tell them). Didn't complete lines 10 and 11 on the 610.
3. Application is sent on to the VEC as a new license application; VEC forwards it to the FCC; FCC has not yet processed the earlier application, so...

Viola - two licenses.

Not allowed under Part 97, yet it can occur by accident.

The applicant doesn't know that the second license didn't dismiss the first--simply enjoys the faster processing. VEs and VEC will not know because the applicant need not bring both the Novice and Technician licenses to the upgrade session--and it's doubtful we'd compare them (if we were supplied with them) to determine that they were issued less than five to seven weeks apart.

The FCC would like to know when two licenses do exist. The example above probably was not caught by their computer because the second license did not include a middle initial.

73,

Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM
Manager
ARRL/VEC.

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 14:56:24 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
bogus.sura.net!udel!gvls1!gvlf9-q!rossi@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com>,
<2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu>, <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com>vls
Subject : Re: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

In article <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com> dls@freedom.genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:

>In article <2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu> lockhart@mothra.nts.uci.edu
(Jack C. Lockhart) writes:

>>In article <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>>>In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson) writes:

>>>Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

>

>>>> call kb6qmu

>>Call-Sign: KB6QMU Class: NOVICE

>>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

>>Valid From: APR 14, 1987 To: APR 14, 1997

>>Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987

>>

>>>> call kk6ch

>>Call-Sign: KK6CH Class: ADVANCED

>>Previously: N6PFB Class: GENERAL

>>Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

>>Valid From: NOV 14, 1989 To: NOV 14, 1999

>>Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989

>

>

>I must have missed the point. What does this prove? Only that Lucia
>UPGRADED from Novice to Advanced class within 1 1/2 years. Good for her!

Is this *really* the VE's mistake? True, somebody goofed but who?

When you upgrade and request a new callsign I would think it would
be up to the FCC to *DELETE* the old entry from their database. The
VE/VEC has no control over this unless the 610 were to slip by indicating
a new license rather than an upgrade. The fact that the person maybe
added or forgot a middle initial should not trigger this to happen.

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA
rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM
Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

Date: Tue, 09 Feb 93 15:41:00 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2959@wrdis01.af.mil>, <1kuc87INN8u6@topaz.bds.com>,
<VBREault.93Feb8171035@rinhp750.gmr.com>y.j
Subject : Re: Abandonment of CW

[I wrote the original note that started this thread.]

In article <VBREault.93Feb8171035@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com (Val Breault) writes:

>In article <1kuc87INN8u6@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>

> > Congratulations! You are one of the few Extra class higher-ups
> > who realizes the futility of CW wpm requirements. As for me,
> > I still have trouble with 5wpm!

>

> Nonsense! Many of the most stident no-code proponents are Extra
> class hams. I did 20 WPM because it was there. While I operate CW,
> I'm nowhere near that fast in real life (I can do 13 solid).
> Frankly the *ONLY* reason the requirement is there is to make it
> HARD to get to the Extra class. Frankly, I'd support another way
> to demonstrate "EXTRA" than CW.

>

> -Ron (W02L)

>

>I too am an Extra Class amateur radio operator and I use Morse code
>almost exclusively when operating on the HF bands. While I would
>scarcely call my stand strident, I would fully support a motion to
>replace the high speed Morse code requirement with a filter that is
>at least as difficult, but much more contemporary.

What is all this talk about filters? Somehow people have forgotten why the incentive licensing system was developed. The point was not to exclude hams. The point was to give hams an incentive to learn more material and be of greater value to the amateur service. Furthermore, the idea was the amateur would be of greater service to the American people.

Each license class brings with increased privileges. It isn't that the higher licenses are designed to keep people out.

>I made a game of it. It was fun. I really got a charge out of
>speeding up the code generator. I really felt pumped when I could
>get those short bursts of really solid copy at 18wpm.

>

>I still do :-) :-)

Sure CW is fun, but how does higher speed CW enhance the value of the amateur service today? The FCC has not set up the incentive licensing to simply challenge us to do arbitrary things. Incentive licensing is supposed to improve the value of the amateur service. However, since incentive licensing was enacted, it would appear the amateur service has become of less value to the American people.

>I don't remember how long I worked on it.... Something like four
>or five months. I didn't think I was ready when the exam date rolled
>around but I had set the night aside for it and wouldn't be able to
>make it to the next couple of testing sessions..... so I gave it a try.

When I was a kid (19) I used CW all the time. Last year, when I thought I'd better get my Extra, I played Super Morse at 22WPM. I found that my copy was still better than 80%. I found the CW boring, too. It didn't take much practice to get ready for the test.

>FACT:

>The high speed code requirement isn't going to go away any time soon.

Why is this a fact? This sounds like an opinion to me.

>OPINION:

>In light of that fact, I believe that anyone that is waiting for
>the requirements to change before proceeding with an upgrade is

>either wasting time, rattling sabers or isn't really all that
>interested in upgrading.

Possibly the upgraded privileges aren't worth the effort involved
for some people?

>When you've gotten your Extra Class license and have nothing to
>gain by removal of the high speed CW requirement, then you can join
>us in our campaign to remove it. Somehow it sounds classier coming
>from an Extra than from a Technician. :-) :-)

Sure, when I was a lowly Advanced class operator, I was criticized
for being "anti-CW", I was told that I just wanted my Extra for
nothing. Well, I easily passed the damn test, now let's take a
fresh look and leave the sentimentality behind. Anyone opposed to
reforming the CW requirements needs to answer me this: How do the
13 and 20 WPM requirements further the charter of the Amateur Service?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 10 Feb 93 12:51:10 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!hri.com!noc.near.net!genrad.com!genrad.com!not-for-
mail@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu>, <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com>,
<2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu>-mail
Subject : Re: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

In article <2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu> lockhart@mothra.nts.uci.edu (Jack
C. Lockhart) writes:

>In article <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

>>In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson)
writes:

>>Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

>>> call kb6qmu

>Call-Sign: KB6QMU Class: NOVICE

>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA
 >Valid From: APR 14, 1987 To: APR 14, 1997
 >Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987
 >
 >>> call kk6ch
 >Call-Sign: KK6CH Class: ADVANCED
 >Previously: N6PFB Class: GENERAL
 >Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927
 >Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285
 >Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA
 >Valid From: NOV 14, 1989 To: NOV 14, 1999
 >Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989

I must have missed the point. What does this prove? Only that Lucia UPGRADED from Novice to Advanced class within 1 1/2 years. Good for her!

--
 ->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-
 ->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690 Mobile<-
 ->AD ASTRA, PER ASPERA Airplane: C-172 N6513E
 <-
 ->GenRad, MS/6, 300 Baker Ave, Concord, Mass. 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

Date: (null)

From: (null)

97.503(a) A telegraphy examination MUST BE SUFFICIENT TO PROVE that the
 examinee has the ABILITY TO SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND and to receive
 correctly by ear texts in the international Morse code at not less
 than the prescribed speed, using all the letters of the alphabet,
 numerals 0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark and
 prosigns ar, bt and sk.

97.509(d) Passing a telegraphy RECEIVING examination is ADEQUATE PROOF of an
 examinee's ABILITY to both SEND and receive telegraphy. The
 administering VEs, however, MAY also include a sending segment
 in a telegraphy examination.

(caps mine)

Now, the questions are: MUST an examinee PROVE that he has the ABILITY
 to SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND?

or: Since the examinee can copy 20wpm by ear does

this mean he can also send 20wpm by hand?

--

Ed Naratil

(All standard disclaimers apply)

Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA

ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 14:56:24 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!caen!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!

howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!udel!gvls1!gvlf9-q!rossi@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com>,

<2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu>, <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com>s.s

Subject : Re: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

In article <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com> dls@freedom.genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:

>In article <2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu> lockhart@mothra.nts.uci.edu (Jack C. Lockhart) writes:

>>In article <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>>>In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson) writes:

>>>Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

>

>>>> call kb6qmu

>>Call-Sign: KB6QMU Class: NOVICE

>>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

>>Valid From: APR 14, 1987 To: APR 14, 1997

>>Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987

>>

>>>> call kk6ch

>>Call-Sign: KK6CH Class: ADVANCED

>>Previously: N6PFB Class: GENERAL

>>Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

>>Valid From: NOV 14, 1989 To: NOV 14, 1999

>>Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989

>

>

>I must have missed the point. What does this prove? Only that Lucia

>UPGRADED from Novice to Advanced class within 1 1/2 years. Good for her!

Is this *really* the VE's mistake? True, somebody goofed but who?

When you upgrade and request a new callsign I would think it would be up to the FCC to *DELETE* the old entry from their database. The VE/VEC has no control over this unless the 610 were to slip by indicating a new license rather than an upgrade. The fact that the person maybe added or forgot a middle initial should not trigger this to happen.

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA
rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM
Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #36
